

**CITY OF REDMOND  
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

January 21, 2016

NOTE: These minutes are not a full transcription of the meeting. Tapes are available for public review in the Redmond Planning Department.

**BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:** David Scott Meade, Craig Krueger, Kevin Sutton, Scott Waggoner

**EXCUSED ABSENCES:** Joseph Palmquist, Mike Nichols

**STAFF PRESENT:** Steven Fischer, Manager; Sarah Vanags, Planner;  
Ben Sticka, Planner

**RECORDING SECRETARY:** Susan Trapp *with* Lady of Letters, Inc.

The Design Review Board is appointed by the City Council to make decisions on design issues regarding site planning, building elevations, landscaping, lighting and signage. Decisions are based on the design criteria set forth in the Redmond Development Guide.

**CALL TO ORDER**

The Design Review Board meeting was called to order by Chair David Scott Meade at 7:00 p.m.

**MINUTES**

**IT WAS MOVED BY MR. SUTTON AND SECONDED BY MR. WAGGONER TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES FROM NOVEMBER 19, 2015. MOTION APPROVED (3-0; 1 ABSTENTION).**

**IT WAS MOVED BY MR. KRUEGER AND SECONDED BY MR. WAGGONER TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES FROM DECEMBER 3, 2015. MOTION APPROVED (4-0).**

**IT WAS MOVED BY MR. SUTTON AND SECONDED BY MR. KRUEGER TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES FROM DECEMBER 17, 2015. MOTION APPROVED (2-0; 2 ABSTENTIONS).**

**APPROVAL**

**LAND-2015-01068, Woodspring Suites Hotel**

**Description:** 120 room hotel on an approximately 1.8 acre commercial parcel

**Location:** 7045 180<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE

**Applicant:** Broc Hendershott *with* West77 VP, LLC

**Prior Review Date(s):** June 4, 2015, September 3, 2015 & October 15, 2015

**Staff Contact:** Benjamin Sticka, 425-556-2470 or [bsticka@redmond.gov](mailto:bsticka@redmond.gov)

Mr. Sticka gave an overview of the project on behalf of staff. Suggestions made at the last meeting review were ganging the windows, adding additional landscaping and improving some roof elements. Since revised elevations were received, staff believed that the Board recommendations had been satisfied, but staff requested further input.

The applicant, Mr. Hendershott stated that the final proposal tonight included changes to cornices and access eaves. In regard to ganging the windows, the architect and applicant agreed to do so vertically, anywhere lap doors were on lap siding, and to a panel product and matching trim color. The brick under entry canopy was taken up to the soffit. The storefront details were revised as well as at the back elevation. Finally, canopies were added at door elevations. Landscaping was added to the renderings.

Mr. Krueger asked if there was a materials board with colors. Mr. Hendershott stated that it had been brought to the Board at the last review meeting. Mr. Krueger asked for clarification on the brick color and

Mr. Hendershott indicated this was a light white-tan with stucco on the sleeve and lap siding painted a wood color. Mr. Hendershott further to explained the cantilevered roof materials. Mr. Krueger asked about the metal in the lower left of the project. Mr. Hendershott replied that these were the window frames in the storefront and the other metal frame would be a similar color.

**COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:**

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated that he believed that in reviewing the last Board meeting notes, the consensus was when the project would be brought back, examples of architecture in other regions would be drawn on, and additional brick under windows and additional colors would be discussed. Mr. Krueger did not believe that the project was at a point for approval at this time.
- Elevations were labeled front, rear, left and right, but the rear elevation is what the city will view and without perspectives on the final view, planning does not appear to be complete. Mr. Hendershott explained that submittal plans were not substantially complete.
- Mr. Krueger stated that a final approval should not be awarded tonight as many details from past minutes had not been addressed, and the elevation along the street requires more color and interest. Mr. Hendershott asked for clarification on the color, and Mr. Krueger stated that the color board showed a light and dark brown only. Mr. Hendershott replied that there was also stucco.
- Mr. Hendershott continued that the intent was to bring a monochromatic modern look similar to projects being built in Kirkland, Bellevue and Medina which incorporate T & G Cedar, hardy panel, and hardy plank.
- Mr. Hendershott stated that other projects such as Washington Square in downtown Bellevue and the Bellevue Hilton Garden Inn were examples of the quality of their work. To clarify around the rear entry, the area would have limited access and visibility and would not be treated as the front entry was.
- Mr. Hendershott explained that his comments were only to explain the perspective taken and not for defensive reasons.

Mr. Waggoner:

- Stated that the project had come a long way since it was first presented, which was appreciated.
- Regarding the landscaping plan, sizable trees would be helpful, but Mr. Waggoner asked about a plan for spacing. Mr. Hendershott reported that code for frontage trees was 30 feet on center and saplings would not be planted in order to obtain robust landscaping from day one.
- Mr. Hendershott stated that comments from the Board around tree size were welcomed. Main pedestrian traffic would move along 180<sup>th</sup>. The building would be moved to save specific established trees. When 70<sup>th</sup> goes through, the entry to the building should be very recognizable.
- Mr. Waggoner commented that the rendering showed very tall trees and this caused confusion. Trees along the street side would be positive for shielding views inside.

Mr. Meade:

- Believed the landscape plan helped the building, but did not think the plan had changed much since the last review and the building still resembled a standard hotel.
- Mr. Meade was not entirely impressed with the plan, but would probably approve.

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated that if the project would be sent back for more revisions, more comments should be made.

Mr. Meade:

- Stated that more interest should be added to the street elevation, the main exposure of the building.

Mr. Waggoner:

- Stated that the plan is clean and cohesive. One element that was confusing was a flat topped box in the middle of the project. A sloped roof could be an option. Mr. Hendershott explained that the flat roof inside the parapet was needed for RTU communication units. Height limits would be checked, but the element could be butterflyed.

Mr. Meade:

- Asked if a heavier cornice trim band could be used in a dark color for a shadow feel. Mr. Waggoner responded that there was a limited eave and brick around other roofs. Using heavier trim might not be a solution. Mr. Meade felt that a row of windows was missing in the center, or something to tie together such as a panel detail.
- Mr. Hendershott replied that when similar ideas were previously explored the design became heavy and distracting. Clean, simple and modern was still the intent. There was no up lighting other than general landscape lighting.

Mr. Waggoner:

- Asked if a window sill line on the first floor should be continued around to create continuity.

Mr. Meade:

- Asked if the end cap should be eliminated. Mr. Hendershott replied that once the landscape matured, the visual feature would be lost.
- Mr. Meade asked if more cedar should be used at the midpoint between spans to add variety. Mr. Hendershott replied that the cedar was a warm color that could be explored to break the elevation.

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated that the EIFS, or external insulation, should stay as it works well with cultural shapes. The comments in summary were to eliminate lower brick, add additional cedar look siding on either side, add slope to the center feature piece, and to add more overhang on the front entry.
- Mr. Sticka asked the Board if approval with conditions could be given at this time, or if the Board would like to see the project with changes again. Mr. Krueger replied that a better look at the street elevation at the fake entry for perspective would be appreciated. Staff had the latitude to share and receive feedback from the Board outside of meetings.
- Mr. Waggoner and Mr. Krueger agreed that they were comfortable with approval with conditions.

**IT WAS MOVED BY MR. KRUEGER AND SECONDED BY MR. SUTTON TO APPROVE LAND-2015-01068, WOODSPRING SUITES HOTEL, WITH MINOR REVISIONS PER COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD, INCLUDING INTRODUCING OTHER LOCATIONS FOR CEDAR SIDING, DELETING BRICK ON the ENDS AND PROVIDING DETAIL ON the ELEVATION FACING TOWARDS 180<sup>TH</sup> FOR STAFF TO REVIEW AND APPROVE, AS WELL AS OTHER DETAILS SUCH AS THE BUTTERFLY ROOF OFFERED DURING THE DISCUSSION. MOTION APPROVED (4-0).**

**APPROVAL**

**LAND-2015-02027/2184, Sawyer Townhomes (Redmond 166<sup>th</sup>)**

**Description:** 9-unit multi-family townhome development with infrastructure and frontage improvements

**Location:** 9471 166<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE

**Applicant:** Jeremy Sather *with* LDC, Inc.

**Staff Contact:** Benjamin Sticka, 425-556-2470 or [bsticka@redmond.gov](mailto:bsticka@redmond.gov)

Mr. Sticka gave an overview of the project on behalf of City staff. The project was before the Board on October 1<sup>st</sup>, 2015. At that time, the Board gave comments about the elevation facing 166<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE, requesting darker window frames and providing a materials board for the railing and patio elevations. The applicant is requesting approval at tonight's meeting.

Mr. Robin Murphy and Mr. Jeff Ko with Jackson Main Architecture and Nathan Chapman with Novelty Hill Development introduced themselves. Mr. Murphy stated that at the last Board meeting there were 10 units in the projects and now the number of units was nine in order to maintain the terrain of the site and for maneuverability for parking. A landscape buffer would be provided on the south side of the units as well as private space with buffering to the three story multi-family residential to the south. The proposal was now nine three-story townhomes in three clusters, five, two and two. Each unit has a single car garage with a stall in front, and end units had two car garages. There was a passive amenity space available in a prime location outside of the buffer.

Internal units include stairs that run parallel to the front wall and end units that have a perpendicular stair. Because of the topography, units would be set approximately a foot lower than the next. Fire lane access, slopes and grading issues constrained design, but two units would have basements approximately six feet above grade at this point, which would require minimal excavation. At the third floor level, there was a bedroom facing north and a bedroom facing south with bathrooms. Basements included an additional bedroom.

There would be a 2-12 roof slope with shed roofs facing north and craftsman style garages, and an emphasis on windows articulated around the living space. Units in the center were identical and stacked, but not mirrored, with a repetition of three. End units were mirrored, and can be entered from the end walls. The materials board showed cement board panels with carefully detailed aluminum extrusions, cedar lap siding and cedar used vertically as well. The color palette was white, beige and teal with stained natural wood siding on the end units. There were four different unit types used repeatedly throughout the assembly. Windows were bronze vinyl rather than white vinyl. The neighborhood is three-story multi-family as well, but the design intent was to keep the profile down.

#### **COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:**

##### Mr. Krueger:

- Stated that the elevations, color palette, mix of materials, shapes, and the harmony of the shed roof looked great.
- Mr. Krueger asked about the front entry. The east elevation of building one was the same as the east elevation of building two and wondered if a treatment at the east elevation could include a front door entry to the street.

##### Mr. Waggoner:

- Agreed with Mr. Krueger about the project's crisp look and said the site was being saved as much as possible.
- Mr. Waggoner understood the concern around a front door entry, but commented that the unit was single and private and did not have a public entrance.

##### Mr. Sutton:

- Agreed with Mr. Krueger including the concern about the street elevation. Pulling materials together around the corner may be helpful including siding and adjusting windows.
- Mr. Sutton would like the small staircase to be more solid with screening or landscaping. Mr. Murphy commented that it is likely that there would be fencing in the area not shown in the rendering presented.
- Mr. Murphy stated that the intention was to create an organization of glass, repeating over and over to reinforce the rhythm. Every unit was part of the whole but also distinct. Modifications such as enlarging windows would not be a problem.

##### Mr. Meade:

- Asked Mr. Krueger and Mr. Sutton if the concern was primarily focused on the right panel section, or if other moves should be considered to bring something more to the design.

- Mr. Murphy stated that the perpendicular stair was open to all three levels, and the overhang was an addition for shelter and to identify the entry. The majority of people using the entry would not arrive from the street.

Mr. Sutton:

- Suggested extending the upper stoop piece, with the toe of the stair further to the garage for a more generous feel. If there were foundation evergreen landscaping this could help heal the building into the site as a residential expression.

Mr. Meade:

- Was confident the design could be modified to appear more residential, and asked if an approval with conditions should be voted on at this time.

**IT WAS MOVED BY MR. KRUEGER AND SECONDED BY MR. WAGGONER TO APPROVE LAND-2015-02027/2184, SAWYER TOWNHOMES, PER THE PRESENTATION DRAWINGS SUBMITTED AT THIS MEETING WITH SOME ATTENTION TO BE PAID TO THE EAST ELEVATION OF BUILDING ONE IN RESPONSE TO BOARD COMMENTS, IN ORDER TO ENHANCE THE ELEVATION STREET PRESENCE. MOTION APPROVED (4-0).**

**PRE-APPLICATION**

**LAND-2015-02200, Bear Creek Mixed-Use**

**Description:** Five story, mixed-use building with 360 residential units, 5,000 SF of live/work apartments and associated parking

**Location:** 15806 to 15904 Bear Creek Parkway

**Contact:** Gary Noyes *with* NW Pacific Development, LLC

**Prior Review Date:** December 3, 2015

**Staff Contact:** Sarah Vanags, 425-556-2426 or [svanags@redmond.gov](mailto:svanags@redmond.gov)

Ms. Vanags reported that this was the second pre-application meeting for the project. The goal was to receive final feedback at this meeting in order to come back for approval shortly. The project was a five story mixed-use building located on Bear Creek Parkway in front of the future rail tracks of Sound Transit. The total site square footage was 75,575. Previous Board comments had centered on how the two buildings could be different but more connected in design to complement each other. The Technical Committee and engineering team asked the applicant to remove a portion of the building last week as the site was constrained by an inability to provide for deviations normally allowed for downtown buildings, and to ensure Sound Transit had the space needed for construction and security. Additional length of the property was removed from the entire length of Bear Creek Parkway and the building was redesigned to accommodate City needs.

The applicant gave an overview of the changes made. The project was further developed in response to Board comments. On the phase one portion, an alternative was developed that was presented at the last meeting to bookend both buildings, and this eliminated the shed roofs on the phase one building. The CMU base was replaced with red baritone brick. The colors were strengthened to a bolder scheme rather than the original earth tones. Comments had been received around the white concrete base of the phase two building, and the white color had been minimized integrating the brick base. The red of the brick base had been brought up into the body of the phase one building. Material had been wrapped around the bookend, and brick material from Bear Creek Parkway had been wrapped around the end of the building.

On the rail side of the phase two building, a comment had been given that the colors were overly complicated. The color palette had been simplified with blue, white and grey. Lighter red brick was used in the center, and on the ends, darker brick was used to break up the length of the building. More comments were requested regarding color. The most decorative light fixtures were at residential entries and simpler cylinder shaped fixtures were away from the main entry.

Mr. Jason Anderson reported on behalf of the applicant that landscape comments were minimal, but there was now an infiltration trench and planting of 15 feet of buffer around the building using native plants. There are many utilities at the street corner, and the right of way may create some complications. There is also some ambiguity around the location of the rail and Sound Transit. Existing planting in the area was associated with the rail lines and street trees, and ground cover remained the same.

**COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:**

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated that the team had done a stellar job in incorporating prior Board comments. The bookends were a solid concept. The elevations were broken up and the use of color was very good. The east end of the phase two building reduced the length of the building visually. The mustard color was a good addition.
- Mr. Krueger asked about the Board comment around the terminus at 159<sup>th</sup> and possibly adding landscaping or vertical sculptural art.

Mr. Waggoner:

- Agreed with Mr. Krueger around the applicant's work to incorporate prior Board comments. Night time lighting views appeared dramatic.
- Mr. Waggoner indicated that at certain elevations of building one, a light grey box protruded in certain places that appeared too massive or closed and wondered if there was a reason for this.
- The applicant replied that those spaces were living, dining and bedroom spaces and some units received more glazing than others to break up the window pattern. Panel sidings would have reveals.
- Mr. Waggoner felt there was more variety, better color and positive movement on the project.

Mr. Sutton:

- Suggested that other material to break up the amount of panel siding should be used, and while changing the color helped, a different treatment such as metal or corrugated panel could be considered to set it apart.
- Mr. Sutton said that building one had a strong L-shaped move at the corners, but the other building did not continue the L-shape on the backside. The cap was there but there was no return down. He agreed that an architectural or landscape element at the terminus should be developed.

Mr. Meade:

- Did not like the beige color and asked that it be brought up to a darker tone. Dark grey worked but the beige appeared pink on the print, and lighting on the presentation made the beige appear to be khaki green.
- Mr. Meade expressed concern around building one and grey and beige insets at the parapet. These appeared approximately two feet deep and he said they should return further to give the illusion of a larger sculptural mass. The wing of the parapet could be extended back another four feet to make the building appear richer.
- Mr. Meade asked about a blue section and orange or red strips between windows on building two. The applicant explained that panel painted in accent color was being examined. This occurred on the east end accenting bookends, both ends of phase two.

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked about materials being used for handrails on decks. The applicant explained that glass or plex type panels with metal frames were being examined.
- Mr. Krueger commented that the vertical frame on the east end of building two is a strong element but missing on one of the elevations as an alternative. The applicant replied that this was doable.
- Mr. Meade asked if the next presentation to the Board would be for approval, and Ms. Vanags replied yes.

## **CONSULTATION**

### **LAND-2015-01469, Marymoor Park Apartments**

**Description:** Multi-family residential development containing a total of 227 dwelling units ranging from studio to 1-, 2-, 3-bedroom units on a 3.07 acre site

**Location:** Approximately 6499 East Lake Sammamish Parkway NE

**Architect:** Raymond Gamo *with* Jackson Main Architects

**Contact:** Mark Hoyt *with* Trammel Crow Residential

**Prior Review:** September 3, 2015 & November 5, 2015

**Staff Contact:** Sarah Vanags, 425-556-2426 or [svanags@redmond.gov](mailto:svanags@redmond.gov)

Ms. Vanags said the project had been before the Board twice and was presented tonight for an approval consultation. The applicant was present for approval, but the materials received by the Board did not align with what had previously been presented, so staff did not feel comfortable recommending approval this evening. However, the applicant had redesigned and would request approval based on the new design. Staff now recommend the project for approval.

Mr. Meade stated that Mr. Krueger would be leaving the meeting shortly and a quorum would not be present afterwards, so the presenter should keep this in mind for time purposes. Ms. Vanags reported that in previous renderings, there was a lot of horizontal modulation and this had been redesigned to include both horizontal and vertical modulation. The presentation this evening would show the project in the spirit of what had been presented initially in both color palette and design.

Mr. Robin Murphy presented the changes made. Parapets were articulated. The building was compressed into a small footprint due to right-of-way and future dedication. Blank facades and the monotone color scheme had been addressed with eyebrow dormers, shed roof elements and subtle color changes.

Mr. Andy Rasmussen talked about the site plan on behalf of the applicant. Modifications were made to the auto court and the grey space in the center had become a paved, colored concrete space, more of a flush curb condition with bollards and valet type parking. Larger patio spaces around the perimeter and significant planting on the street side were added. On the Marymoor park side, a terraced plaza that led to a common open space was created. Higher end finishes including a porous paver system, instead of porous concrete, had been added. A possible connection to the park was being discussed with the County and may or may not occur.

Mr. Meade asked about the materials board and metal siding material that was significantly different than the rest. Mr. Murphy replied that the metal siding provided relief from the cement board. One of the comments at the last meeting was around an exposed south side of the garage. In response, screening was created pushing to the east side that was more visible in a randomized pattern.

## **COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:**

### **Mr. Krueger:**

- Asked about a handrail or guardrail system to add interest. Mr. Murphy pointed out the detail of the rails on the plan.

### **Mr. Meade:**

- Pointed out that the project is very complicated and every iteration had been excellent. The new siding materials, more consideration around edges and the parking area would bring the project to a new level.

Mr. Krueger:

- Liked the changes brought to the Board tonight. The view from the streetscape was much better.
- On the west side, Mr. Krueger understood why windows were reduced in width but this was not appealing. This was his only comment.

Mr. Waggoner:

- Agreed with Mr. Krueger's assessment of the project.
- Mr. Waggoner wondered if a detail or color treatment could be used to enhance the cream colored boxes.

Mr. Sutton:

- Really liked the design.
- Mr. Sutton asked why there was a gap in the garage screening. Mr. Murphy replied that the intent was for more randomization but the gap could be filled in. Mr. Sutton stated that the gap caught his eye.

Mr. Meade:

- Had a comment regarding possibly missing an element around corners. The building, site and elevations were complicated and a calm piece would be welcome, but possibly an element around corners could be explored with staff.

Mr. Waggoner:

- Would have no problem with the architect and staff working on a possible element around the corners together.

Mr. Meade:

- Supported the idea of Mr. Sutton to remove garage screening gaps.

**IT WAS MOVED BY MR. KRUEGER AND SECONDED BY MR. SUTTON TO APPROVE LAND-2015-01469, MARYMOOR PARK APARTMENTS, WITH STANDARD CONDITIONS FOR INCONSISTENCIES. GARAGE SCREEN GAP ELIMINATION AND OTHER CHANGES COMMENTED ON BY THE BOARD WILL BE WORKED ON BY THE APPLICANT AND STAFF. MOTION APPROVED (4-0).**

**MR. KRUEGER LEFT THE MEETING AT 8:48 P.M.**

**PRE-APPLICATION**

**LAND-2015-01974, Redmond Town Center Archer Hotel**

**Description:** Seven story building on the single lot, five stories for hotel and multi-functional use and two stories for a 170 car parking garage

**Location:** 7210 164<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE

**Contact:** Bob Mannon *with* LodgeWorks Partners, LP

**Staff Contact:** Sarah Vanags, 425-556-2426 or [svanags@redmond.gov](mailto:svanags@redmond.gov)

Ms. Vanags said this was the second pre-application meeting for the project. The site is the current location of the Claim Jumper restaurant. The project goal was to obtain approval at the next presentation. Board comments from the previous visit were focused on landscaping and garage screening. The design presented at this meeting was very similar to the previous presentation in regard to the rooms and around how the site would appear in the evenings.

Mr. Roger Brown with LK Architecture and Mr. Bob Mannon, Vice President of Development at LodgeWorks Partners introduced themselves. Mr. Brown displayed the latest renderings and explained that the palette had been filled out more. There was not a sample board available. The floor plan filled the entire site, property line to property line, with the exception of the street side on the north end. There is a parkway between the lot and BJ's Restaurant. The parking garage was in between the lobby and hotel



rooms, as the water table level is approximately three feet below grade, leaving few options. Similar materials to the remodeled Town Center entrances would be used. Stone, glass windows, undulation, and exterior fenestration were pointed out. Vertical towers broke up the length of the building, and balconies were on corners with floor to ceiling glazing, aluminum handrails with wire horizontals, and verticals accented with a crown element of shed roof.

Large roll-up glass garage doors were pointed out as well as an 18 foot deep patio on the east face. The bar opened to the covered patio space and would be an indoor-outdoor space in good weather, but the glass would be there year round. On the Bear Creek Parkway side, the parking deck was exposed to the sky and a lattice relief over the parking area created a crown element. The ground level consisted of meeting rooms, a swimming pool and a large exercise space.

The predominant material in the recessed patio space along the meeting rooms was a porcelain tile with a wood look, allowing warmth and richness, with 32 different patterns and color combinations. The ramp to the hotel was hidden behind glass, and glass was in the lower sections with mullions above. Anywhere the slab came out to create a line, a wood type material would be desired underneath to accent with warmth. Service delivery and the entrance could only be located on one specific elevation. The intent was to create transparency making anyone driving or walking by feel welcome to come in. The building should be unique as to not appear to be another office building.

#### **COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:**

##### Mr. Waggoner:

- Commented that the parking garage was unique and remarkable given the fact that the garage cannot be underneath the building.
- Mr. Waggoner asked if there were elevators or another function occurring inside the tower elements. Mr. Brown replied that the intent of the tower element was to break up the parapet element and also hide mechanical equipment on the roof.
- Mr. Waggoner stated that the first impression was strong. The porcelain tile looked good as well as the stone texture.
- Mr. Waggoner asked if frosted glass would be used and Mr. Brown replied that the garage undulates in the exterior wall.
- Mr. Waggoner stated that the logic and characters would fit into the neighborhood and it would be a nice addition to the Town Center.

##### Mr. Sutton:

- Agreed with Mr. Waggoner's assessment of the project.
- Mr. Sutton asked if the stone column elements could be wider, stone extending all the way up or if stopping before, widening the piece to add weight. Mr. Meade stated he felt the same way and asked if an option might be replacing the porcelain wood at the bottom with stone to unite the design.
- Mr. Brown replied that the columns were approximately two feet square, framed with stone double the size of the columns to create a powerful effect with the stone. Extending the stone to the top was not favored by the owners. Looking at the elevations, Mr. Brown said the horizontal tile band around the building base helped the design. Plank may be used if code allows.

##### Mr. Waggoner:

- Stated that the indoor-outdoor area may require additional heating at times but was a nice effect.
- Mr. Waggoner stated that with as much exposure as the end has, stone across the piers may be a way to strengthen the tower element.

##### Mr. Meade:

- Recommended that the project be brought back to a future meeting for approval and Mr. Waggoner agreed.
- Mr. Meade asked Ms. Vanags if anything more was needed at this time, and she replied no.

## **PRE-APPLICATION**

### **LAND-2015-02302, Redmond Town Center Apartments**

**Description:** One mixed-use residential building +/- 234,100 SF, approximately 289 residential units with 9,000 SF of retail space and 520 parking stalls.

**Location:** NE 74<sup>th</sup> Street and 168<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE

**Contact:** Chris Nagamine *with* Encore Architects

**Staff Contact:** Sarah Vanags, 425-556-2426 or [svanags@redmond.gov](mailto:svanags@redmond.gov)

Ms. Vanags said project was before the Board once previously when samples of other buildings worked on by the applicant were presented. The Board provided comment around the anchor corners of the building, to find ways to emphasize architecture on the corner wall and to better emphasize the pedestrian experience. The applicant had developed a more substantial rendering of the proposed product although not all previous comments had been addressed.

The applicant, Ms. Chris Nagamine with Encore Architects, explained that the modulation of the building and a possible asymmetrical approach to the massing was suggested by the Board at the last meeting. Articulation was suggested on all four sides of the project as well, as it would be a large structure in the Town Center. The Board suggested that the corner on NE 74<sup>th</sup> Street and 168<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE should be treated as something special and that the building should have a strong base element without ignoring the top of the project. Pedestrian scale, providing enough retail area with transparency and screened parking were also important to the Board.

Mr. Nagamine explained the new design rendering using a Kit of Parts. The first element, the anchor, was the brick. The second element was bays which are metal panel product. The third element was the core of the structure, and the fourth element was the ribbon or a texture of warm material to provide detail and approachability from the façade.

The brick anchors defined the corners, being solid and weighty, as we as defining the base. The bays added another level of modulation to building facades. The ribbon element could be utilized not only on the façade but also at the residential units off NE 74<sup>th</sup> and as a parking screening element. Asymmetrical massing was addressed with each elevation being treated differently. The Kit of Parts allowed the applicant and staff to break down the scale of the building and create different looks depending on the location of the viewer. The stronger base middle and top would be more modern and contemporary in design.

In the plan, the amount of retail space square footage was increased by approximately 20%. The space is now 9,000 SF overall and approximately 48 ft. deep. Staff recommended providing landscaping on 168<sup>th</sup> in front of the residential units to create a privacy setback. Units facing north were sacrificed to provide for more retail space. The left floor plan was the lower level parking garage, limiting excavation to one level of parking due to the water table. The main ground floor was the main building entry. A secondary entry at the northwest corner would be an entry for bike riders and an amenity space dedicated to care of bicycles as well as a dog wash and grooming area. Vehicle traffic would enter the building from the west across from the Macy's loading dock. Parking would be wrapped on two sides and screening would be provided at the north and west.

Level three contained a 70' x 100' courtyard as well as common amenity space for residents. A small cabana building could be added to the courtyard. The building overall was approximately 270' x 240'. Levels four and five contained 65 units per floor with loft units at the top. A large amenity space over 750 SF was being considered for the rooftop but the City needed to be consulted. Smaller areas on the roof may need to be considered instead.

Landscape was being discussed further as well as seating outside the retail area. An almost continuous canopy was planned. The rendering presented did not represent all of the elements discussed. The applicant was hoping for Board comments specifically on the modulation depth, and the applicant

proposed a 2'-3' setback between the face of the white metal base and building façade. The brick elements would be 3' deep but not to the 4' level addressed in design guidelines. Additional comments were requested around adding more to the prominent corner, placement of depths and the ribbon element.

#### **COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:**

##### Mr. Waggoner:

- Stated that the randomized elevations and differences on each side created a more modern take on traditional definition.
- Mr. Waggoner stated that the anchors were of a very large scale but they needed to be very large due to the overall size of the project.
- Mr. Waggoner commented that the building had a feel of an older building which had been rehabilitated and repurposed. He said that there was a jump between the huge scale of certain elements versus fine detail scale of others such as balconies and railing systems.
- Mr. Waggoner stated that the street level had a contradiction in appearance. While certain areas made sense, the size of the building created a complicated scenario around this.
- Mr. Waggoner stated that planning appeared to be done well, parking and service areas were hidden as well as possible, and that the project would have a different look and feel than surrounding buildings but because of the building size, this was appropriate.
- Mr. Waggoner recommended that the play of different scales against each other continue to be refined, within close enough proximity of each other to be seen in a single view. Overall, this was a unique project for the area with an appeal to the apartment market.

##### Mr. Sutton:

- Liked the project a lot and could relate to the logic in design.
- Mr. Sutton stated that two areas still needed work but the applicant had already called attention to both, the back and placement of the decks. The decks that occurred in the white metal panel should be different than other areas.
- Mr. Sutton indicated that all corner column supports may need to come all the way down into the brick and not just on the one corner.

##### Mr. Meade:

- Stated that he really liked the project and this was a very nice job with a large building. The project was elegant in refinement and stately.
- Mr. Meade commented that corners had been addressed very well but using a material to give the corners a greater sense of permanence would be helpful.
- Mr. Meade agreed with Mr. Waggoner that the building had the feel of an older, treasured building that had been rehabilitated and reanimated.
- Mr. Meade believed that the retail piece was designed very well and was much more useful than in the first iteration.
- Mr. Meade supported the previous idea of solidifying the front corner. The bay design around the building was refreshing and less expected.
- Mr. Meade stated that while the design track was previously good, the design was even better at this time and the hard work was obvious. After some refinement, approval may be warranted at the next presentation. The team had made a parking garage into a great space.
- Mr. Meade asked if Ms. Vanags needed anything further from the Board at this time and she stated no.

### **DISCUSSION**

Mr. Steve Fischer, Senior Planner, briefed the Board regarding positions to be filled. In 2011, term limits were added to the Design Review Board. There are two vacant positions and others upcoming, for Mr. Palmquist, Mr. Waggoner and Mr. Meade. Positions have been recommended to the Mayor. Interviews will be scheduled as soon as they can be. In past years during advertising, very few applications had been received, but at this time there were many applications being received. Mr. Meade asked Mr. Fischer about an attempt in the past to change the term limit and Mr. Fischer reported that the City Council had not been interested in pursuing that. Mr. Fischer stated that he would update the Board with new developments.

Mr. Fischer reported on the memorial service for Dennis Lisk, Senior Planner, who passed away January 8, 2016.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

**IT WAS MOVED BY MR. SUTTON AND SECONDED BY MR. WAGGONER TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 9:50 P.M. MOTION APPROVED (3-0).**

February 18, 2016  
MINUTES APPROVED ON

  
RECORDING SECRETARY